

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,800	06/13/2005	Wilhelm Jorg	2034-100US	8804
25881 EPSTEIN DR A	7590 07/09/200 NGEL BAZERMAN	EXAMINER		
EPSTEIN DRANGEL BAZERMAN & JAMES, LLP 60 EAST 42ND STREET			. NGUYEN, KIEN T	
SUITE 820 NEW YORK, I	NY 10165		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3711	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVEDVACORE
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	$\mathcal{H}$					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/538,800	JORG, WILHELM				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The AAAH IN C.	Kien T. Nguyen	3711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ARANDONE.	J. pely filed the mailing date of this communication.				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 A	<u>oril 2007</u> .					
·						
	The state of the first is the first is the first is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
	arminer. Note the attached Office	Action of form P1O-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicationity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	(PTO-413)				
P) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te				

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen U.S. Patent 4,550,456 in view of Adams et al U.S. Patent 6,536,791.

Allen disclosed a swing or cradle comprising a frame with four side elements (10, 12) and four connecting elements (14) (see Figs. 1 and 4); the frame is rectangular, can be suspended on four fastening devices (16, 18) on four connecting elements; the connecting elements (14) are bent tube sections with lower and upper half shelves. It is noted that Allen failed to teach the use of a plurality of interwoven band elements with fastening elements as taught in the claimed invention. However, such interwoven bands with fastening means are very well known in the art, especially in outdoor chairs and seats. For example, Adams disclosed a chair comprising a plurality of interwoven bands with each bands having fastening means (41, 43, 45) for fastening the bands to a seat frame as shown in Fig. 12. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the fabric seat (4) of Allen with the interwoven bands as taught by Adams for the purpose of increasing the durability of the seat while maintaining its flexibility.

Regarding various mechanical differences between the combination of Allen and Adams and claims 8, 9, 15, and 16, such differences are considered obvious

mechanical expediencies and can be used interchangeably or substitute with each other.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen modified by Adams as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Evans U.S. Patent 118,918.

It is noted that the frame of Allen does not show the side elements for curved as set forth therein. However, Evans disclosed a swing or cradle having a frame (a, c) with at least one frame element is curved forming a downwardly curved bearing surface. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the frame elements of Allen as modified by Adams with the curved frame elements as taught by Evans for the purpose of accommodating the shape of the user.

## Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that the structures of the cradle/swing of Allen are incompatible with the seating surface in Adams, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as stated above, the purpose of modifying the fabric seat of Allen with the interwoven bands as taught by Adams is to increase the durability of the seat while maintaining its flexibility.

## Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kien T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4428. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kien T. Nguyen/ Kien T. Nguyen, Primary Examiner Art Unit 3711

Ktn